



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/484,730	01/18/2000	Bartfeld Eyal	2000-001	1034

23521 7590 12/04/2003

SALTAMAR INNOVATIONS
30 FERN LANE
SOUTH PORTLAND, ME 04106

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

22

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/484,730

Applicant(s)

EYAL, BARTFELD

Examiner

Reuben M. Brown

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 73-134 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 73-134 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues on page 13, that "Krisbergh is directed to access system from a remote information source, rather than a messaging system as in the present invention". While examiner does agree that Krisbergh discloses an access system (col. 14, lines 19-20), such a characterization does not preclude a messaging system. Since Krisbergh clearly transmits e-mail messages over a CATV distribution system, the relevant portions of the disclosure are indeed applicable to the claimed invention. Krisbergh '970 is a standard e-mail system that allows users to both send and receive e-mail.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2611

3. Claim 120-121 & 123, 125-126 & 132-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krueger, (U.S. Pat # 6,460,075).

Considering claim 120, Krueger teaches the claimed method for handling messages, adapted to a TV messaging gateway comprising the steps of recording a voice message, automatically packing the message into e-mail and sending the e-mail; see col. 5, lines 49-60; col. 6, lines 1-18 & col. 7, lines 60-67.

Considering claim 121, Krueger is a two-way e-mail system, therefore the claimed feature of the voice and e-mail message being in response to a received message is included in the reference; see col. 3, lines 58-60.

Considering claim 123, the claimed method for handling messages in a unified messaging system over a TV network, comprising features that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 120, is likewise analyzed. As for the claimed unified messaging system, since Krueger handles at least text, and multi-media e-mail messages that may include audio and/or video messages, (Abstract; col. 5, lines 35-45 & col. 3, lines 41-62), the server system reads on the claimed subject matter.

As for the claimed feature of digitizing the outgoing recorded message and automatically packaging the message in an outgoing e-mail and sending the message, see col. 5, lines 45-67 & col. 6, lines 1-20 & col. 7, lines 58-67.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claim 125, the claimed method for handling messages, adapted to operate in conjunction with a messaging server comprises features that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 120, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claim 126, Krueger transmits user-outgoing messages via the upstream network.

Considering claims 132-134, a computer operates Krueger and thus reads on the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 122, 124, 127 & 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger.

Considering claims 122 & 127, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was known to use a telephone to send a message. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to operate Krueger in a manner wherein a telephone is used for voice input, instead of the microphone discussed in Krueger, at least for the desirable advantage of utilizing premise equipment already available at most user premises.

Considering claim 124, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was known in the art to upload audio/video messages from a subscriber to a central database for recording. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krueger, with the known technique of uploading audio/video data from a subscriber, for transmission to another subscriber, at least for the desirable benefit of reducing the amount of processing necessary at the originating subscriber's premise.

Considering claim 128, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, message receipt notification was very well known in the art. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krueger with the well known technique of notification of the receipt of message, at least for the desirable improvement of informing the user in the case the instant user is not at the STB or computer terminal.

Art Unit: 2611

6. Claims 73-74, 77-83, 85-90, 92, 101-102, 106, 111, 113, 116 & 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krisbergh, (U.S. Pat # 5,999,970), hereinafter referred to as Krisbergh '970, in view of Born, (U.S. Pat # 6,064,440).

Considering claim 73, the claimed TV messaging gateway for handling messages, such that the gateway is adapted to operate in conjunction with a TV distribution system having a central location connected to a video downstream network constructed to carry video signals and distribute the signals to the plurality of terminals is met by the application server 68, which is located in the headend server 38 that transmits video and data services over a CATV system; see Fig. 1; Fig. 5; col. 5, lines 10-65.

The claimed terminal for selectively displaying a video signal on a TV screen, at least reads on the TV set 56, of Fig. 1, which displays TV programs selected by the subscriber. The claimed upstream network capable of delivering user input signals from a remote location to the central location is met by the discussion in Krisbergh '970 of a sender-subscriber sending video mail to a receiver, col. 4, lines 10-45; col. 5, lines 40-58 & col. 8, lines 61-664.

The claimed feature of the messaging gateway operating in conjunction with a messaging server that is constructed to store and forward messages, such that the gateway comprises a message control interface adapted to couple the messaging server for controlling at least one message, such that the messages have an attached address for being associated with at least one

Art Unit: 2611

user is met by the disclosure of Krisbergh '970. The reference teaches the use of a post office 76 and caching engine 78 that stores and forwards e-mails, col. 5, lines 40-63.

Therefore additionally claimed feature of the messaging gateway, in conjunction with a messaging server, comprising a message control interface and controls the messages, such that the messages have address information, corresponding to at least one subscriber is also met by Krisbergh '970, col. 5, lines 40-68.

The claim further recites a video output module for generating video signals corresponding to the addressable message, such that the video signals are transmitted on a downstream network to a plurality of addressable terminals. Krisbergh '970 teaches that refresh information, which represent a small change of an image displayed on a TV screen may be sent using VBI technology, col. 7, lines 14-40. Apparently, this refresh information sent via VBI technology also includes e-mail data, even though Krisbergh does not explicitly make such a disclosure. Nevertheless, even if the e-mail message is sent in the VBI in Krisbergh '970, at the time the invention was made, it was known to transmit data, such as Internet or e-mail information as a regular video signal.

In particular Born, discloses the transmission of numerous types of services over a CATV system, using the well-known VBI technology, Abstract; col. 2, lines 17-35 & col. 3, lines 8-18. However, Born discloses that in order to achieve a higher data throughput, the CATV operator may use the regular lines of video to transmit the data services, instead of the only line 21 of the

Art Unit: 2611

VBI, col. 10, lines 1-20. Born teaches that this option is particularly useful when there are video channels available, but no video content available to be transmitted over a particular available channel.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970 to transmit Internet data over a full video channel, instead of the VBI at least in order to utilize available video channel bandwidth, thereby obtaining a higher data throughput, as taught by Born. Furthermore, Born is of particular relevance to the claimed invention, since it is disclosed that e-mail messages is included in the types of data that may be transmitted using the disclosed transmission techniques; see col. 11, lines 55-67.

Considering claim 74, Krisbergh '970 teaches that the application server stores and forwards e-mail messages and includes user address information, col. 5, lines 45-65.

Considering claim 77, the receiver device in Krisbergh '970 comprises a means for receiving user-generated messages, i.e., e-mail, col. 4, lines 31-56.

Considering claims 78 & 80, Krisbergh '970 teaches that the upstream channels may utilize a CATV distribution network 12, which reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 8, lines 61-64.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claim 79, Krisbergh '970 teaches that the user input signal may be from a remote control, which meets the claim, col. 8, lines 52-60.

Considering claims 81-82, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, speech recognition technology for making user input signals via voice was very well known in the art. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Krisbergh '970 & Born, with the old art of speech recognition technology for taking voice input, at least for the known advantage of making the system more accessible to a wider range of users, such as those without sight.

Considering claim 83, both Krisbergh '970 (col. 4, lines 57-67 & col. 6, lines 10-21) and Born (col. 3, lines 15-20 & col. 4, lines 27-35) are coupled to an IP based network for reception and transmission of user messages.

Considering claim 85, the claimed centralized module reads on the application server 68 of Krisbergh '970, Fig. 3 & Fig. 5. The claimed local module is broad enough to read on the processing functions located within the set top converter 54 that enable the e-mail services, col. 8, lines 23-34.

Considering claim 86, see Krisbergh '970 col. 5, lines 27-67.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claim 87, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, message receipt notification was very well known in the art. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970 with the well known technique of notification of the receipt of message, at least for the desirable improvement of informing the user in the case the instant user is not at the STB or computer terminal.

Considering claim 88, Krisbergh '970 at least supports the transmission of text messages.

Considering claim 89, see Krisbergh '970 col. 1, lines 45-67 & col. 3, lines 5-36.

Considering claim 90, Krisbergh '970 transmits digital video signals, and e-mail messages include address information, col. 9, lines 44-67.

Considering claims 92 & 119, Official Notice is taken that a graphical display on a user TV indicating the progress of the execution or playback of an application was well known at the time the invention was made. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970 with the known feature of visually indicating to a user the progress of an application, at least for the desirable benefit assisting the subscriber in programming selection.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claims 101 & 113, the claimed method steps for handling messages, adapted for operating in a TV distribution system having a TV messaging gateway in a central location, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 73, and is likewise treated.

Considering claim 102, Krisbergh '970 teaches users entering outgoing messages via the upstream network, col. 9, lines 18-42.

Considering claim 106, in Krisbergh '970 the TV messaging gateway is comprised of a centralized module and a local module, located at the user premise, col. 5, lines 26-67 & col. 4, lines 31-56.

Considering claim 111, a computer operates Krisbergh'970 and thus reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 5, lines 10-67.

Considering claim 116, Krueger discloses a messaging system that handles at least text and multi-media messages that may include video and/or audio messages.

Art Unit: 2611

7. Claims 75, 84, 105, & 117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krisbergh '970 & Born, in view of Krisbergh, (U.S. Pat # 5, 138,649) hereinafter referred to as Krisbergh '649.

Considering claims 75 & 117, both Krisbergh '970 and Born, teach the use of remote controls as a user input device to enter user commands. Neither reference teaches the use of a telephone keypad, user voice input, or a combination thereof. Nevertheless, Krisbergh '649, discloses a combination of a remote control device and telephone handset, Abstract & col. 1, lines 41-55 & col. 2, lines & col. 3, lines 50-65. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Krisbergh '970 & Born, with the well known technology of a telephone handset as a user input device, at least for the desirable benefit of the convenience of such an arrangement, as taught by Krisbergh '649.

Considering claims 84 & 105, Krisbergh '970 does not teach the user of a user input using a microphone. However, Krisbergh '649 discloses a microphone attached to a remote control, (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 50-60). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970 with the teachings of Krisbergh '649, combining a telephone and remote control, at least for the known improvement of reducing the number of user input devices.

Art Unit: 2611

8. Claims 76, 91, 103-104, 114-115 & 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krisbergh '970 & Born, in view of Krueger.

Considering claim 76, Krisbergh '970 & Born only discuss a messaging system that handles standard e-mail. However, Krueger introduces a system that includes e-mail with multi-media such as audio & video, col. 5, lines 45-58. Therefore the messaging server in Krueger reads on the claimed unified messaging server; see col. 2, lines 24-35 & col. 3, lines 7-64. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Krisbergh '970 & Born, with the technology of adding multimedia content to an e-mail (col. 3, lines 36-40), requiring a unified messaging server, at least for the desirable benefit providing the users with a more expressive e-mail message.

Considering claims 91 & 103-104, Krisbergh '970 & Born only discuss a messaging system that handles standard e-mail. However, Krueger introduces a system that includes e-mail with multi-media such as audio & video, col. 5, lines 45-58. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Krisbergh '970 & Born, with the technology of adding multimedia content to an e-mail (col. 2, lines 5-14 & col. 3, lines 36-40), at least for the desirable benefit providing the users with a more expressive e-mail message.

Considering claim 114, Krisbergh '970 only discuss a messaging system that handles standard e-mail. However, Krueger introduces a system that includes e-mail with multi-media

Art Unit: 2611

such as audio & video, col. 5, lines 45-58. Therefore the messaging server in Krueger reads on the claimed unified messaging server; see col. 2, lines 24-35 & col. 3, lines 7-64. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970, with the technology of adding multimedia content to an e-mail (col. 3, lines 36-40), at least for the desirable benefit providing the users with a more expressive e-mail message.

Krueger teaches the claimed features of recording a voice message, automatically packing the message into e-mail and sending the e-mail; see col. 5, lines 49-60; col. 6, lines 1-18 & col. 7, lines 60-67.

Considering claim 115, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was known to use a telephone to send a message. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to operate Krisbergh '970 & Krueger in a manner wherein a telephone is used for voice input, instead of the microphone discussed in Krueger, at least for the desirable advantage of utilizing premise equipment already available at most user premises.

Considering claim 118, Krueger utilizes a microphone, col. 5, line 51.

9. Claims 93, 99, 107, 112 & 129-130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krisbergh '970, in view of Krisbergh '649.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claims 93 & 129, the claimed gateway for handling messages that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 73, with respect to Krisbergh '970, are likewise analyzed. Examiner notes that claim 93 is broader than claim 73, in that the instant claim does not require that the addressed message is in video format. Therefore even if the e-mail messages are transmitted in the VBI in Krisbergh '970, the instant reference still reads on the claimed subject matter, since the e-mails are displayed on a TV screen, col. 4, lines 31-45.

As for the additionally claimed feature of a telephone handset for user input, Krisbergh '970 teaches the use of a remote control. However the reference does not teach the use of a telephone keypad, as a user input device to enter user commands. Nevertheless, Krisbergh '649 discloses a combination of a remote control device and telephone handset, Abstract & col. 1, lines 41-55 & col. 2, lines & col. 3, lines 50-65. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970, with the well known technology of a telephone handset as a user input device, at least for the desirable benefit of the convenience of such an arrangement, as taught by Krisbergh '649.

Considering claim 99, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, speech recognition technology for making user input signals via voice was very well known in the art. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Krisbergh '970, with the old art of speech recognition

Art Unit: 2611

technology for taking voice input, at least for the known advantage of making the system more accessible to a wider range of users, such as those without sight.

Considering claim 107, the claimed method for handling messages, corresponds with subject matter mention above in the rejection of claim 93, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claim 112, a computer operates Krisbergh'970 and thus reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 5, lines 10-67.

Considering claim 130, the claimed centralized module reads on the application server 68 of Krisbergh '970, Fig. 3 & Fig. 5. The claimed local module is broad enough to read on the processing functions located within the set top converter 54 that enable the e-mail services, col. 8, lines 23-34.

10. Claim 94-98, 100, 108-110 & 131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krisbergh '970 and Krisbergh '649, and further in view of Krueger.

Considering claims 94, 110 & 131, Krisbergh '970 only discusses a messaging system that handles standard e-mail. However, Krueger introduces a system that includes e-mail with multi-media such as audio & video, col. 5, lines 45-58. Therefore the messaging server in Krueger reads on the claimed unified messaging server; see col. 2, lines 24-35 & col. 3, lines 7-

Art Unit: 2611

64. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970, with the technology of adding multimedia content to an e-mail (col. 3, lines 36-40), requiring a unified messaging server, at least for the desirable benefit providing the users with a more expressive e-mail message.

Considering claim 95, Krisbergh '970 teaches that the upstream channels may utilize a CATV distribution network 12, which reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 8, lines 61-64.

Considering claim 96, in Krisbergh '970 the TV messaging gateway is comprised of a centralized module and a local module, located at the user premise, col. 5, lines 26-67 & col. 4, lines 31-56.

Considering claim 97, Krisbergh '970 optionally utilized a bi-directional TV network for two-way communications, col. 1, lines 45-60 & col. 4, lines 26-31.

Considering claim 98, Krisbergh '970 may be coupled to an IP network, col. 1, lines 35-41 & col. 4, lines 53-65.

Considering claim 100, Krisbergh '970 only discuss a messaging system that handles standard e-mail. However, Krueger introduces a system that includes e-mail with multi-media such as audio & video, col. 5, lines 45-58. Therefore the messaging server in Krueger reads on the claimed unified messaging server; see col. 2, lines 24-35 & col. 3, lines 7-64. It would have

Art Unit: 2611

been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970, with the technology of adding multimedia content to an e-mail (col. 3, lines 36-40), requiring a unified messaging server, at least for the desirable benefit providing the users with a more expressive e-mail message.

Considering claim 108, Krisbergh '970 only discuss a messaging system that handles standard e-mail. However, Krueger introduces a system that includes e-mail with multi-media such as audio & video, col. 5, lines 45-58. Therefore the messaging server in Krueger reads on the claimed unified messaging server; see col. 2, lines 24-35 & col. 3, lines 7-64. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Krisbergh '970, with the technology of adding multimedia content to an e-mail (col. 3, lines 36-40), at least for the desirable benefit providing the users with a more expressive e-mail message.

Krueger teaches the claimed features of recording a voice message, automatically packing the message into e-mail and sending the e-mail; see col. 5, lines 49-60; col. 6, lines 1-18 & col. 7, lines 60-67.

Considering claim 109, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was known to use a telephone to send a message. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to operate Krisbergh '970 & Krueger in a manner wherein a telephone is used for voice input, instead of the microphone discussed in

Art Unit: 2611

Krueger, at least for the desirable advantage of utilizing premise equipment already available at most user premises.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's claims

A) Wagner Teaches using available video channels to broadcast information generally transmitted in the VBI or HBI; see col. 6, lines 51-64. The reference also provides a teaching of e-mail alerts or notifications; see col. 9, lines 15-18.

B) Campbell Another teaching of the well-known technology of broadcasting information generally transmitted in the VBI or HBI, Abstract; col. 2, lines 30-42 & col. 4, lines 63-65.

C) Fitser Teaches a subscriber using the DTMF technology from a telephone to access a messaging system and speech recognition technology; see col. 3, lines 4-36.

Art Unit: 2611

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-6861 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-2399.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Andrew I. Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular
communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Reuben M. Brown


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600